	Case 3:06-cv-05383-RBL Docume	ent 56 Filed 09/25/07	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
10	AT TACOMA		
11			
12	RODNEY STEVEN MITUNIEWICZ,		
13	Plaintiff,		
14	V.	Case No. C06-5	3383RBL
15	HAROLD CLARK et. al.,	REPORT AND	A TIVO N. TIO
16	Defendants,	RECOMMEND DISMISS THIS WITHOUT PRE	ACTION
17		NOTED FOR:	EJUDICE
18		OCTOBER 26,	2007
19			
20	This Civil Rights/Americans With a Disabilities Action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate		
21	Judge pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates' Rules MJR 1, MJR		
22	3, and MJR 4. This action was filed in July of 2006. (Dkt. # 1). The court issued an order to show cause why		
23	this action should not be dismissed without prejudice because Mr. Mituniewcz appears to now be a member of		
24	the class action covering the same issues in <u>Paralez v.Washington Department of Corrections</u> , 06-CV-		
25	5298JKA.		
26	Class certification occurred August 10, 2007, in the <u>Paralez</u> case and the class has been defined as:		
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	All disabled inmates of the Washington Department of Corrections who, since October 30, 2003, have been partially or wholly denied participation in the Department of Corrections' work release program because of a disability.		
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION		

(Paralez v Washington Department of Corrections, 06-CV-5298JKA, Dkt. # 33 (order granting certification and defining class)). Mr. Mituniewicz did not respond to the court's order to show cause. Defendants believe Mr. Mituniewicz is properly a member of the class and this action should be dismissed (Dkt # 55). The court now recommends this action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** as Mr. Mituniewicz is part of the class action in Paralez v. Washington Department of Corrections, 06-CV-5298JKA. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b) of the Federal rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have ten (10) days from service of this Report to file written objections. See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Failure to file objections will result in a waiver of those objections for purposes of appeal. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Accommodating the time limit imposed by Rule 72(b), the clerk is directed to set the matter for consideration on October 26, 2007, as noted in the caption. Dated this 25 day of September, 2007. /S/ J. Kelley Arnold J. Kelley Arnold United States Magistrate Judge